

### **REMARKS**

This responds to the Office Action dated July 2, 2007.

Claims 1 and 3-5 are amended, no claims are canceled, and claims 6-20 are added; as a result, claims 1-20 are now pending in this application.

#### **§112 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner states that the phrase “choosing a best route for e node” is not clear since the Specification does not disclose what an “e node” is and its relationship with the other nodes recited in the claim.

Claims 1, 4 and 5 have been amended to more clearly define Applicant’s claimed invention. As noted in the Specification, at Fig. 3 (block 69) and p. 4, lines 3-13, Applicant teaches choosing a preferred route to a particular node from a given node when there are two or more routes remaining after the elimination of the longer routes and the cyclic routes. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

#### **New Claims**

Applicant respectfully submits that the new claims are fully supported from the Specification. Regarding claims 9 and 10, as noted at Figs. 1 & 2 and p. 3, lines 3-5, Applicant teaches providing global addressing of local memories (24) throughout the computer system having a plurality of processing nodes. Regarding claims 15 and 20, as noted at Fig. 2 and p. 3, lines 1-2, Applicant teaches associating a separate routing table (32) with its respective router port (30). Allowance of these new claims is respectfully requested.

### **RESERVATION OF RIGHTS**

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have addressed every assertion made in the Office Action. Applicant’s silence regarding any such assertion does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or

legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record are relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6909 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.

P.O. Box 2938

Minneapolis, MN 55402

(612) 373-6909

Date

November 16, 2007

By

Thomas F. Brennan

Thomas F. Brennan

Reg. No. 35,075

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 16 day of November 2007.

CANDIS BUENDING

Name

Signature

Candis Buending